

# EMBEDDABLE PROPERTIES OF METRIC $\sigma$ -DISCRETE SPACES

SZYMON PLEWIK AND MARTA WALCZYŃSKA

**ABSTRACT.** Dimensional types of metric scattered spaces are investigated. Revised proofs of Mazurkiewicz-Sierpiński and Knaster-Urbanik theorems are presented. Embeddable properties of countable metric spaces are generalized onto uncountable metric  $\sigma$ -discrete spaces. Some related topics are also explored. For example: For each infinite cardinal number  $\mathfrak{m}$ , there exist  $2^{\mathfrak{m}}$  many non-homeomorphic metric scattered spaces of the cardinality  $\mathfrak{m}$ ; If  $X \subseteq \omega_1$  is a stationary set, then the poset formed from dimensional types of subspaces of  $X$  contains uncountable anti-chains and uncountable strictly descending chains.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose  $X$  and  $Y$  are topological spaces. The symbol  $X <_E Y$  means that  $X$  is homeomorphic to a subspace of  $Y$ . If  $X <_E Y$ , then we say that  $X$  has a dimensional type smaller or equal to the dimensional type of  $Y$ . When  $X <_E Y$  and  $Y <_E X$ , then  $X$  and  $Y$  have the same dimensional type, what we denote briefly  $X =_E Y$ . When  $X <_E Y$  and is not fulfilled  $Y <_E X$ , then  $X$  has a smaller dimensional type than  $Y$ . First time the relation  $<_E$  was investigated by M. Fréchet [4]. In [16, p. 24] W. Sierpiński cites alternative names for dimensional types: type de dimensions, Fréchet; Homöie, Mahlo. Basic properties and definitions relating to dimensional types are also discussed in textbooks [17], [11] and [12]. K. Kuratowski uses the name topological rank for dimensional type, [11, p. 112]. It is widely known - some authors treat them like a mathematical folklore, compare [5] - the following results.

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 54G12; Secondary: 03E10, 06A06.

*Key words and phrases.* Embedding, Scattered space, Metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space.

In [13] S. Mazurkiewicz and W. Sierpiński proved the following two facts. *There is continuum many non-homeomorphic countable metric and scattered spaces. A countable compact metric space  $X$  is homeomorphic to the ordinal  $\omega^\alpha n + 1$ .* In the second claim  $n = |X^{(\alpha)}|$  is a natural number and  $X^{(\alpha)}$  is the first discrete derivative of  $X$ , where  $\alpha \in \omega_1$ . The countable ordinal  $\omega^\alpha n + 1$  is equipped with the order topology.

B. Knaster and K. Urbanik [9]: *Any countable metric scattered space has a metric scattered compactification.* An alternative proof is given in the monograph [11, Theorem 6, p. 25].

R. Telgársky [18, Theorem 9]: *Any metric scattered space can be embedded into a sufficiently large ordinal number.* Independently, the same is also proved in [1].

The poset  $(P(\mathbb{Q}), <_E)$ , where  $P(\mathbb{Q})$  is the family of all subsets of the rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$ , is described by W.D. Gillam in the paper [5]. The set  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q})/=_E$  of all equivalence classes  $[X] = \{Y \subseteq \mathbb{Q} : Y =_E X\}$  is partially ordered by the relation  $[X] \leq_d [Y]$  whenever  $X <_E Y$ . In [5], it is shown that the poset  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q})/=_E, \leq_d)$  has cardinality  $\omega_1$  and  $[\mathbb{Q}]$  is the only element with  $\omega_1$  many elements below it. Moreover,  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q})/=_E, \leq_d)$  lacks infinite anti-chains and infinite strictly descending chains. In fact,  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q})/=_E, \leq_d)$  is described using the Cantor-Bendixson rank, local homeomorphism invariants and local embeddable properties regarding the position of points in a countable metric scattered space. Initially, we believed that analogous invariants should work successfully in the case of uncountable metric scattered spaces. Now, we are going to check the rationality of those beliefs.

For any space  $X$ , the  $\alpha$ -derivative of  $X$ , which is denoted  $X^{(\alpha)}$ , is defined inductively:  $X^{(0)} = X$ ;  $X^{(\alpha+1)} = \{x \in X^{(\alpha)} : x \text{ is not isolated in } X^{(\alpha)}\}$ ;  $X^{(\alpha)} = \bigcap \{X^{(\beta)} : \beta < \alpha\}$  for a limit ordinal  $\alpha$ . Thus, each  $X^{(\alpha)}$  is a closed subset of  $X$ . If there exists an ordinal  $\alpha$  such that  $X^{(\alpha)} = \emptyset$ , then  $X$  is called a *scattered* space. The smallest ordinal such that  $X^{(\alpha)} = \emptyset$  is denoted  $N(X)$  and is called the Cantor-Bendixson *rank* of  $X$ . Other notions of set theory and topology will be used according to textbooks [2] and [10]. In particular, the sum of topological spaces we use like in the book [2, p. 103].

The paper is organized as follows. The results, which we consider completely new ones are formulated as theorems or lemmas. Modifications of known facts or facts from mathematical folklore are formulated as propositions or corollaries. Proofs of propositions refer to the original idea of S. Mazurkiewicz and W. Sierpiński relying on the use of ordinal arithmetic. In fact, we extend this arithmetic by adding a new element, i.e. the subspace  $I \subset \omega^2 + 1$ , compare Section 5. Our intention is to initiate research directions of dimension types in terms of ordinals and metric  $\sigma$ -discrete spaces. So, we carefully analyze the tools that have been used successfully in countable cases.

## 2. REMARKS ON ORDINAL ARITHMETIC

Ordinal arithmetic is comprehensively described in many textbooks of modern set theory, and so we only briefly discuss aspects we need. Topological properties of subsets of ordinals will be considered only with the order topology, i.e. the topology generated by open rays  $\{\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$  and  $\{\beta : \beta > \alpha\}$ , where  $\alpha$  is an ordinal. So, we reconsider schemes of ordinal arithmetic, which were used in the paper by S. Mazurkiewicz and W. Sierpiński [13]. For ordinal numbers, we will use the convention  $\alpha = \{\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ . If  $\beta \in \alpha$ , we write  $\beta < \alpha$ , except for phrases  $n \in \omega$ , where  $n$  is a finite ordinal and  $\omega$  is the first infinite ordinal. Suppose  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are ordinals, then  $\alpha + \beta$  is the unique ordinal  $\gamma$  which is isomorphic to a copy of  $\alpha$  followed by a copy of  $\beta$ . The addition of ordinals is associative, but not commutative. Also  $\beta < \alpha$  implies  $\beta + \gamma \leq \alpha + \gamma$ , for any ordinal  $\gamma$ . The ordinal  $\gamma$  added  $n$ -times is denoted  $\gamma \cdot n$ . If  $\{\lambda_n : n \in \omega\}$  is a sequence of ordinals, then

$$\sum_{n \in \omega} \lambda_n = \sup\{\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_n : n \in \omega\}.$$

The following limit ordinals are important because of the above mentioned Mazurkiewicz-Sierpiński theorem. Put  $\omega^0 = 1$ ,  $\omega^1 = \omega$  and define the countable limit ordinal

$$\omega^\alpha = \sup\{\omega^\beta \cdot n : \beta < \alpha \text{ and } 0 < n \in \omega\},$$

for each countable ordinal  $\alpha$ . If  $\beta < \omega^\alpha$ , then the interval  $(\beta, \omega^\alpha)$  is isomorphic to  $\omega^\alpha = [\emptyset, \omega^\alpha)$  and also these intervals are homeomorphic. If  $\beta < \omega^\alpha$ , then

$$\omega^\alpha + 1 = \beta + \omega^\alpha + 1 =_E \omega^\alpha + \beta + 1.$$

If  $\gamma > \sup \gamma$  is a countable infinite ordinal, then there exist  $n \in \omega$  and an ordinal  $\alpha$  such that  $\omega^\alpha \cdot n + 1 =_E \gamma$ . If  $\gamma$  is a limit ordinal, then there exist  $n \in \omega$  and ordinals  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  such that the subspace  $\omega^\alpha \cdot n + 1 \setminus \{\beta\} \subseteq \omega^\alpha \cdot n + 1$  is homeomorphic to  $\gamma$ . We omit details of mentioned above facts. Instead of this, we present the following.

**Proposition.** *If  $0 < \alpha$ , then  $N(\omega^\alpha) = \alpha$  and  $N(\omega^\alpha + 1) = \alpha + 1$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\alpha = 1$ , then  $\omega + 1$  is homeomorphic to a convergence sequence. So,  $(\omega + 1)^{(1)} = \{\omega\}$  and  $(\omega)^{(1)} = \emptyset$ , hence  $N(\omega) = 1$  and  $N(\omega + 1) = 2$ .

Suppose, that the thesis holds for all non-zero  $\beta < \alpha$ . If  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ , using the induction assumptions, we get

$$(\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\beta)} = \{\omega^\beta \cdot n : 0 < n \in \omega\} \cup \{\omega^\alpha\} =_E \omega + 1.$$

Therefore  $(\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\alpha)} = \{\omega^\alpha\}$  and  $(\omega^\alpha)^{(\alpha)} = \emptyset$ . Hence  $N(\omega^\alpha) = \alpha$  and  $N(\omega^\alpha + 1) = \alpha + 1$ .

Suppose  $\omega^\alpha = \sum_{n \in \omega} \omega^{\beta_n}$ , where  $\alpha = \sup_{n \in \omega} \beta_n$  is a limit ordinal. For any  $\beta < \alpha$ , by the induction assumptions, we have

$$(\omega^\beta)^{(\alpha)} = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^\alpha \in (\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\beta)}.$$

Bearing this in mind, we check that

$$(\omega^\alpha)^{(\alpha)} = \bigcup \{(\omega^{\beta_n})^{(\alpha)} : n \in \omega \text{ and } \beta_n < \alpha\} = \emptyset.$$

We still have  $\omega^\alpha \in (\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\beta_n)}$ , therefore  $(\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\alpha)} = \{\omega^\alpha\}$ .  $\square$

### 3. ON $\sigma$ -DISCRETE METRIC SPACES

A metric space is called  $\sigma$ -discrete, if it is an union of countably many discrete subspaces. Any countable metric space, being countable sum of single points, is  $\sigma$ -discrete. In particular, the space  $\mathbb{Q}$  of all rational numbers is  $\sigma$ -discrete.

**Lemma 1.** *Each metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space  $X$  is an union of countably many closed and discrete subspaces.*

*Proof.* Use the Bing theorem [2, 4.4.8] in the following way. Let

$$\mathcal{B} = \bigcup \{\mathcal{B}_n : n \in \omega\}$$

be a  $\sigma$ -discrete base for  $X$ , where each  $\mathcal{B}_n$  is a discrete family. And let  $X_0, X_1, \dots$  be discrete subspaces summing  $X$ . If  $x \in X_k$ , then fix  $V_x^m \in \mathcal{B}_m$  such that  $V_x^m \cap X_k = \{x\}$ . If there is no relevant  $V_x^m$ , then put  $V_x^m = \emptyset$ . And put

$$X_{k,m} = X_k \cap \bigcup \{V_x^m : x \in X_k \text{ and } V_x^m \in \mathcal{B}_m\}$$

and then check that sets  $X_{k,m}$  are such that we need.  $\square$

Let  $B(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m}^\omega$  be the Baire space of weight  $\mathfrak{m}$ , where  $\mathfrak{m}$  is an infinite cardinal. Since  $0 \in \mathfrak{m}$ , we can put

$$C(\mathfrak{m}) = \{y \in B(\mathfrak{m}) : \text{almost all coordinates of } y \text{ are equal to } 0\}$$

and consider  $C(\mathfrak{m})$  with the topology inherited from  $B(\mathfrak{m})$ . Each Baire space  $B(\mathfrak{m})$  is metric and each  $C(\mathfrak{m})$  is a  $\sigma$ -discrete metric subspace. Note that  $C(\omega_0)$  is a homeomorphic copy of the rational numbers and the Baire space  $B(\omega_0)$  is homeomorphic to the irrational numbers. Therefore is why the next proposition says that spaces  $C(\mathfrak{m})$  are analogues of the rational numbers. A characterization of the rational numbers generalized by the next proposition is usually attributed to G. Cantor, L. E. J. Brouwer or W. Sierpiński.

**Proposition.** *A nonempty metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space, with all nonempty open subsets of weight  $\mathfrak{m}$ , is homeomorphic to  $C(\mathfrak{m})$ . A metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space of the weight  $\mathfrak{m}$  is homeomorphic to a subspace of  $C(\mathfrak{m})$ .*

*Proof.* See T. Przymusiński [15], compare Sz. Plewik [14].  $\square$

**Proposition.** *A metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space contains a homeomorphic copy of the rational numbers or it is scattered.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space which is not scattered. Thus  $X$  contains a dense in itself subspace which, being metric and dense in itself, has to contain a homeomorphic copy of the rational numbers.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** *Any metric scattered space is  $\sigma$ -discrete.*

*Proof.* K. P. Hart offered us the following elementary reasoning. Let  $(X, \varrho)$  be a metric scattered space. For every  $x \in X$ , let  $\alpha_x$  be the

ordinal such that  $x \in X^{(\alpha_x)}$  and  $x \notin X^{(\alpha_x+1)}$ , and then fix a natural number  $n_x$  such that  $B(x, \frac{1}{n_x}) \cap X^{(\alpha_x)} = \{x\}$ . Finally put

$$D_n = \{x \in X : n_x = n\}.$$

If  $x, y \in D_n$  and  $x \neq y$ , then  $\varrho(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{n}$ . So,  $X$  is the countable union of closed and discrete sets  $D_n$ .  $\square$

Applying metrization theorems – for example the Stone theorem, compare [2, 4.4.1] – one obtains the following. A metric locally  $\sigma$ -discrete space is  $\sigma$ -discrete. And then one can check that if a metric space  $X$  is not  $\sigma$ -discrete, then the set

$$\{x \in X : \text{no neighborhood of } x \text{ is } \sigma\text{-discrete}\}$$

is dense in itself. It gives us an other proof of Theorem 2.

Each metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space is paracompact in a stronger sense.

**Theorem 3.** *Every open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of a metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space  $X$  has a disjoint open refinement.*

*Proof.* Modifying Engelking's reasoning 1.3.2 from [3], one can obtain the following. If a normal space is an union of countably many closed and discrete subspaces, then it has a base consisting of closed-open sets. So, any metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space has a base consisting of closed-open sets.

Let closed and discrete sets  $X_{k,m} \subseteq X$  are defined as in the proof of lemma 1. Fix  $k$  and  $m$ . The family

$$\{V_x^m : x \in X_{k,m}\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_m$$

is discrete. So, we can choose the closed-open sets  $W_x^m \subseteq W \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $W_x^m \subseteq V_x^m$ , for each  $x \in X_{k,m}$ , such that

$$X_{k,m} \subseteq \bigcup \{W_x^m : x \in X_{k,m}\}$$

and the union  $\bigcup \{W_x^m : x \in X_{k,m}\}$  is closed-open. Note that, the family  $\{W_x^m : x \in X_{k,m}\}$ , being discrete, consists of pairwise disjoint sets. Sets  $X_{k,m}$  enumerate as  $\{Y_n : n \in \omega\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{W}_0 = \{W_x^m : x \in Y_0 = X_{k,m}\}$ . If  $X_{k,m} = Y_n$  and families of closed-open sets  $\mathcal{W}_0, \mathcal{W}_1, \dots, \mathcal{W}_{n-1}$  are already defined such that unions  $\bigcup \mathcal{W}_0, \bigcup \mathcal{W}_1, \dots, \bigcup \mathcal{W}_{n-1}$  are closed-open sets, then let  $\mathcal{W}_n$  be the family

$$\{W_x^m \setminus \bigcup \{\bigcup \mathcal{W}_i : i < n\} : x \in Y_n \text{ and } x \notin \bigcup \{\bigcup \mathcal{W}_i : i < n\}\}.$$

The union  $\bigcup\{\mathcal{W}_n : n \in \omega\}$  is a needed refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ .  $\square$

We get a modification of the Telgársky result, see [18, Theorem 3].

**Theorem 4.** *Every base of a metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space contains a locally finite open refinement.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space such that  $X = X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \dots$ , where subspaces  $X_n$  are closed, discrete and pairwise disjoint. Fix a base  $\mathcal{B}$ . Afterward, apply the following algorithm. Choose a cover  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  such that if  $x \in X_0$  and  $x \in A \in \mathcal{U}$ , then  $A \cap X_0 = \{x\}$ . By Theorem 3, the cover  $\mathcal{U}$  has a disjoint open refinement  $\mathcal{W}$ . Choose a refinement  $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  and a disjoint open refinement  $\mathcal{W}^*$  such that

$$\mathcal{W}^* \prec \mathcal{U}^* \prec \mathcal{W} \prec \mathcal{U}.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that there exists a unique neighborhood  $A_x \in \mathcal{U}^*$  such that  $A_x \cap X_0 = \{x\}$ , for each  $x \in X_0$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}^0$  be the family of all such selected sets  $A_x$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{U}^0$  and

$$\mathcal{V}^0 = \{A \in \mathcal{W}^* : A \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset\}$$

are discrete families. Since  $\mathcal{V}^0 \subseteq \mathcal{W}^*$ , then the union of all elements of  $\mathcal{V}^0$  is a closed-open set.

Assume that discrete families  $\mathcal{U}^0, \mathcal{U}^1, \dots, \mathcal{U}^n$  and  $\mathcal{V}^0, \mathcal{V}^1, \dots, \mathcal{V}^n$  are already defined such that the union  $Y = \bigcup\{A \in \mathcal{V}^k : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$  – of closed-open and pairwise disjoint sets – is a closed-open subset of  $X$ . Repeat the above algorithm by substituting  $X \setminus Y$  for  $X$  and  $\{A \in \mathcal{B} : A \subseteq X \setminus Y\}$  for  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $X_{n+1} \setminus Y$  for  $X_0$ . As a result, we get a discrete family  $\mathcal{U}^{n+1} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  and a discrete family  $\mathcal{V}^{n+1}$  consisting of pairwise disjoint closed-open sets. From the properties of our algorithm we get that  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}^0 \cup \mathcal{U}^1 \cup \dots \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  is a locally finite cover of  $X$ . Indeed, the family  $\mathcal{V}^0 \cup \mathcal{V}^1 \cup \dots$  is a disjoint open refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ . Also, each  $A \in \mathcal{V}^n$  meets no element of  $\mathcal{U}^k$ , for  $k > n$ . Thus, if  $x \in A \in \mathcal{V}^n$ , then there exist open neighborhoods  $B_0, B_1, \dots, B_{n-1}$  of  $x$  such that any  $B_k$  meets at most one element of the discrete family  $\mathcal{U}^k$ . Therefore, the intersection  $A \cap B_0 \cap B_1 \cap \dots \cap B_{n-1}$  meets at most finitely many elements of the cover  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ .  $\square$

In other words, Theorem 4 says that each metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space is totally paracompact. R. Telgársky [18] only shows that metric scattered spaces are totally paracompact, so we receive a little stronger

result. Simplified versions of Theorem 3 are applied in papers by V. Kannan and M. Rajagopalan [8, (1974)], A. Arosio and A.V. Ferreira [1, (1980)] and R. Telgársky [18, (1968)]. Note that, for similar facts it is applied phrase "Every finite open cover of ..." in textbooks on dimension theory, for example in [3] or [2].

Now, discuss constructions which will be used in further proofs. Let  $\{X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$  be a family of scattered spaces such that  $X_\beta^{(\beta)} = \{g_\beta\}$ . If additionally  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal, then let  $J(\{X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\})$  be the hedgehog space with spininess  $X_\beta$ . The hedgehog space is formed by gluing points  $g_\beta$  into the point  $g$ . The metric is determined such that points of  $X_\beta$  are at the same distance as in  $X_\beta$ , but the distance between points from different spininess is obtained by the addition of distances of these points from  $g$ . Since  $J(\{X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\})^{(\alpha)} = \{g\}$ , this hedgehog space is metric scattered with the one-point  $\alpha$ -derivative.

**Proposition 5.** *For any ordinal  $\alpha$  there exists a metric scattered space with the one-point  $\alpha$ -derivative.*

*Proof.* If  $\alpha \in \omega_1$ , then the ordinal  $\omega^\alpha + 1$  satisfies the thesis. Suppose that for each  $\beta < \alpha$  there exists a metric scattered space  $Y_\beta$  such that  $Y_\beta^{(\beta)} = \{g_\beta\}$ . If  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ , then put

$$X = Y_\beta \times (\omega + 1) \setminus \{(y, \omega) : y \in Y_\beta \text{ and } y \neq g_\beta\}.$$

When  $X$  is equipped with the topology inherited from the product topology, then  $X$  is a metric space such that  $X^{(\alpha)} = \{(g_\beta, \omega)\}$ . If  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal, then we construct  $X$  adapting the construction of a hedgehog space, compare [2, 4.1.5.]. For  $\beta < \alpha$ , spaces  $Y_\beta$  are homeomorphic to spininess of the hedgehog space  $X$  and the point formed by gluing points  $g_\beta$ , will be the only point in the space  $X$  belonging to its  $\alpha$ -derivative.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be an infinite cardinal and  $\alpha$  be an ordinal such that  $\mathfrak{m} \leq \alpha < \mathfrak{m}^+$ . There exists a metric scattered space of the cardinality  $\mathfrak{m}$  which has nonempty  $\alpha$ -derivative.*

*Proof.* Each metric scattered space  $X$ , where  $X^{(\alpha)} \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathfrak{m} \leq \alpha < \mathfrak{m}^+$ , from the above proposition can be constructed so to have the cardinality  $\mathfrak{m}$ .  $\square$



#### 4. ON PROOFS OF MAZURKIEWICZ-SIERPIŃSKI AND KNASTER-URBANIK THEOREMS

Let us demonstrate, how to use the Telgársky idea – modified here as Theorem 3, to simplify a proof of the Mazurkiewicz-Sierpiński theorem: *If  $X$  is a countable compact metric space, then  $X$  is homeomorphic to the ordinal  $\omega^\alpha n + 1$ , where  $\alpha < \omega_1$  and  $n \in \omega$  are uniquely determined.* Assume that  $X$  is a countable compact metric space. If the derivative  $X^{(1)}$  is empty, then  $X$  has to be finite since it is compact, hence  $X$  is homeomorphic to the ordinal  $\omega^0 \cdot |X| = 1 \cdot |X|$ . If  $|X^{(1)}| = n$ , where  $0 < n \in \omega$ , then  $X$  has to be the sum of  $n$  copies of a convergent sequence, hence  $X$  is homeomorphic to the ordinal  $\omega \cdot n + 1$ . Assume inductively that if  $N(X) \leq \alpha$ , then  $X$  is homeomorphic to the ordinal  $\omega^\beta \cdot n + 1$ , where  $\beta < \alpha$  and  $n \in \omega$ . Now suppose that  $|X^{(\alpha)}| = 1$ . By Theorem 3 - the difference  $X \setminus X^{(\alpha)}$  is an infinite sum of pairwise disjoint closed-open subsets, each one has the empty  $\alpha$ -derivative. The subspace  $X \setminus X^{(\alpha)}$  is homeomorphic to the sum

$$(\omega^{\beta_0} \cdot n_0 + 1) \oplus (\omega^{\beta_1} \cdot n_1 + 1) \oplus \dots,$$

by the induction conditions. If  $\alpha = \gamma + 1$ , then one can assume that every  $\beta_n = \gamma$ . If  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal, then every  $\beta_n < \alpha$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n = \alpha$ . In both cases we obtain that  $X$  is homeomorphic to  $\omega^\alpha + 1$ . If  $|X^{(\alpha)}| = n \in \omega$ , then  $X$  has a finite open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  such that each  $V \in \mathcal{U}$  meets  $X^{(\alpha)}$  at a single point and members of  $\mathcal{U}$  are pairwise disjoint. Therefore  $X$  is homeomorphic to the sum of  $(\omega^\alpha + 1)$  taken  $n$ -times and consequently  $X$  is homeomorphic to  $\omega^\alpha \cdot n + 1$ .

Recall that B. Knaster and K. Urbanik [9] proved that any countable metric scattered space is homeomorphic to a subset of a countable ordinal. Therefore, it has a metric scattered compactification, which is a closed subset of some  $\beta + 1$ , where  $\beta < \omega_1$ . A proof that any countable metric scattered space has a countable metric compactification, which is scattered, was also presented in [12, p. 25]. For compact  $X$ , the proof by S. Mazurkiewicz and W. Sierpiński indicates the smallest ordinal number in which  $X$  can be embedded. For any countable metric scattered space a similar indication is not clearly described. So, let us describe the ordinals, which are essential for the induction proof of the Knaster-Urbanik theorem. When  $\alpha$  is a countable ordinal, let  $E(\alpha)$  be the least ordinal such that any countable metric scattered space with the one-point  $\alpha$ -derivative can be embedded into  $E(\alpha)$ . Thus  $E(0) = 1$

and  $E(1) = \omega^2 + 1$ , and also  $E(m) = \omega^{2m} + 1$  for any  $m \in \omega$ . In fact, we have the following version of Gillam Lemma 8, see [5].

**Proposition 7.** *If  $m \in \omega$ , then  $E(m) \leq \omega^{2m} + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $X$  is a countable metric space such that  $X^{(1)} = \{g\}$ . Let  $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$  be a decreasing base at the point  $g$ . Then any one-to-one function  $f : X \rightarrow \omega^2 + 1$  such that  $f(g) = \omega^2$  and any image  $f[U_n \setminus U_{n+1}]$  is contained in the interval  $(\omega \cdot n, \omega \cdot (n+1))$  has to be an embedding of  $X$  into  $\omega^2 + 1$ . Therefore  $E(1) \leq \omega^2 + 1$ .

Assume that if  $Y$  is a countable metric space such that  $Y^{(m-1)} = \{h\}$ , then  $\omega^{2m-2} + 1$  contains a homeomorphic copy of  $Y$  such that the point  $h$  corresponds to the ordinal  $\omega^{2m-2}$ . Suppose  $X$  is a countable metric space such that  $X^{(m)} = \{g\}$ . Choose a family  $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$  of closed-open sets such that it is a decreasing base at the point  $g$  and each set  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  intersects  $X^{(m-1)}$ . By Theorem 3, each  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  is a union of pairwise disjoint closed-open sets  $Y_{n,k}$  such that

$$Y_{n,k} \cap X^{(m-1)} = \{g_{n,k}\}.$$

Based on inductive assumptions, there exist embeddings

$$f_{n,k} : Y_{n,k} \rightarrow \omega^{2m-2} + 1$$

such that each point  $g_{n,k}$  corresponds to the ordinal  $\omega^{2m-2}$ . Line up images  $f_{n,k}[Y_{n,k}]$  such that  $f_{n,i}[Y_{n,i}]$  followed by  $f_{n,i+1}[Y_{n,i+1}]$ , for  $i \in \omega$ . We get embeddings  $f_n : U_n \setminus U_{n+1} \rightarrow \omega^{2m-1}$ . Again, line up images  $f_n[U_n \setminus U_{n+1}]$  and ordinals  $\{\omega^{2m-1} \cdot k : 0 < k \in \omega\}$  such that  $f_0[U_0 \setminus U_1]$  followed by  $\{\omega^{2m-1}\}$  followed by  $f_1[U_1 \setminus U_2]$  followed by  $\{\omega^{2m-1} \cdot 2\}$  followed by  $f_2[U_2 \setminus U_3]$  and so on. Except for  $n = 0$ , we have

$$f_n[U_n \setminus U_{n+1}] \subset [\omega^{2m-1} \cdot n + 1, \omega^{2m-1} \cdot (n+1)] = (\omega^{2m-1} \cdot n, \omega^{2m-1} \cdot (n+1) + 1).$$

This means that images  $f_n[U_n \setminus U_{n+1}]$  are contained in pairwise disjoint closed-open intervals. So, we get the embedding  $f : X \rightarrow \omega^{2m} + 1$ , as far as we put  $f(g) = \omega^{2m}$ . Therefore  $E(m) \leq \omega^{2m} + 1$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 8.** *If  $m \in \omega$ , then  $E(m) = \omega^{2m} + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X(1) = \omega^2 + 1 \setminus \{\omega \cdot k : k \in \omega\}$ . So  $X(1)^{(1)} = \{\omega^2\}$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $f : X(1) \rightarrow \omega^2 + 1$  is an embedding such that

$$\beta = f(\omega^2) = \sup f[X(1)].$$

Put  $\beta_1 = \sup f[\omega]$  and  $f[X(1)] \cap [0, \beta_1] = A_1$ . Since  $A_1$  is infinite, we have  $\beta > \beta_1 \geq \omega$ . Inductively assume that ordinals  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{n-1}$  and discrete infinite subspaces  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{n-1} \subset f[X(1)]$  are already defined and  $\beta_k = \sup A_k \geq \omega \cdot k$ , for  $0 < k < n$ . Choose an infinite and discrete subspace

$$A_n \subseteq f[X(1)] \cap (\beta_{n-1}, \beta)$$

and put  $\beta_n = \sup A_n$ . Assuming inductively that  $\beta_{n-1} \geq \omega \cdot (n-1)$  we get  $\beta_n \geq \omega \cdot n$ . This implies  $\omega^2 \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n \leq \beta$ . Therefore  $E(1) = \omega^2 + 1$ .

Let  $m > 1$ . Assume that the space  $X(m-1) \subseteq \omega^{2m-2} + 1$  is already defined such that  $X(m-1)^{(m-1)} = \{\omega^{2m-2}\}$  and  $X(m-1)$  can not be embedded into  $\beta < \omega^{2m-2}$ . Take a countable infinite family  $\mathcal{S}$  consisting of copies  $X(m-1)$ . Let  $X(m) = \bigcup \mathcal{S} \cup \{g\}$  be equipped with the topology, where  $\bigcup \mathcal{S}$  inherits the sum topology and the point  $g$  has a decreasing base of neighborhoods  $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$  such that each  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  is the union of an infinite many copies of  $X(m-1)$ . By the definition,  $X(m)$  can be embedded into  $\omega^{2m} + 1$  such that the point  $g$  corresponds to the ordinal  $\omega^{2m}$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $f : X(m) \rightarrow \omega^{2m} + 1$  is an embedding such that  $\beta = f(g) = \sup f[X(m)]$ . Put  $\beta_0 = \sup f[U_0 \setminus U_1]$  and  $f[X(m)] \cap [0, \beta_0] = A_0$ . By the induction assumptions, we get  $\beta > \beta_0 \geq \omega^{2m-1}$ . Inductively assume that ordinals  $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1}$  and subspaces  $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{n-1} \subset f[X(m)]$  are already defined such that

$$\beta > \beta_k = \sup A_k \geq \omega^{2m-1} \cdot (k+1),$$

for each  $k < n$ . Let  $A_n \subset f[X(m)] \cap (\beta_{n-1}, \beta)$  be an infinite union of copies of  $X(m-1)$  such that  $\beta > \sup A_n = \beta_n$ . Since  $\beta_{n-1} \geq \omega^{2m-1} \cdot n$  we get  $\beta_n \geq \omega^{2m-1} \cdot (n+1)$ . This implies  $\omega^{2m} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n \leq \beta$ . Therefore  $E(m) = \omega^{2m} + 1$ .  $\square$

Defined in the above proof spaces  $X(m)$  can be added the same way as ordinals, except that the result of such addition must be equipped with the inherited topology. However, such an extension rules seem to be a good topic for future research.

**Proposition 9.** *Let  $\alpha = \gamma + m$ , where  $m \in \omega$  and  $\gamma < \omega_1$  is a limit ordinal. Then  $E(\alpha) = \omega^{\gamma+2m+1} + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let the space  $X(\omega)$  be such that  $X(\omega)^{(\omega)} = \{g\}$ . Moreover, the point  $g$  has a decreasing base of neighborhoods  $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$  such that

each  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  is an infinite sum of copies of  $X(k)$ , defined in the proof of Corollary 8, where  $k$  runs by infinitely many natural numbers. Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $f : X(\omega) \rightarrow \omega^{\omega+1} + 1$  is an embedding such that  $\beta = f(g) = \sup f[X(\omega)]$ . Put  $\beta_0 = \sup f[U_0 \setminus U_1]$  and  $f[X(\omega)] \cap [0, \beta_0] = A_0$ . By the induction assumptions, we have  $\beta > \beta_0 \geq \omega^\omega$ . Inductively assume that ordinals  $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1}$  and subspaces  $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{n-1} \subset f[X(\omega)]$  are already defined and

$$\beta > \beta_{n-1} = \sup A_{n-1} \geq \omega^\omega \cdot n.$$

Let  $A_n \subset f[X(\omega)] \cap (\beta_{n-1}, \beta)$  be an infinite sum of copies of  $X(k)$ , where  $k$  runs by infinitely many natural numbers. We get

$$\beta > \sup A_n = \beta_n > \beta_{n-1} \text{ and } \beta_n \geq \omega^\omega \cdot (n+1).$$

Assuming inductively that  $\beta_{n-1} \geq \omega^\omega \cdot (n-1)$  we get  $\beta_n \geq \omega^\omega \cdot n$ . Therefore  $\omega^{\omega+1} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n \leq \beta$  and  $E(\omega) = \omega^{\omega+1} + 1$ . Similarly, one can prove that  $E(\gamma) = \omega^{\gamma+1} + 1$  for each limit ordinal  $\gamma < \omega_1$ . And also in analogy to the proof of Corollary 8, one can get  $E(\gamma + m) = \omega^{\gamma+2m+1} + 1$ , whenever  $m \in \omega$  and  $\gamma < \omega_1$  is a limit ordinal.  $\square$

**Proposition 10.** *If  $0 < \alpha < \omega_1$ , then any countable metric space with nonempty  $\alpha$ -derivative contains a homeomorphic copy of  $\omega^\alpha + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a countable metric space. Without loss of generality, assume that  $X^{(\alpha)} = \{g\}$ . If  $\alpha = 1$ , then  $X$  contains a convergent sequence, which is homeomorphic to  $\omega + 1$ . Suppose, that the thesis holds for all  $\beta < \alpha$ . Fix a metric  $\varrho$  on  $X$ . Choose nonempty closed-open sets  $V_n \subseteq X \setminus \{g\}$  such that  $V_n \subseteq B(g, \frac{1}{n})$ . By the induction assumptions each  $V_n$  contains a homeomorphic copy of  $\omega^{\beta_n} + 1$ , where  $\beta_n < \alpha$ . So, we choose copies of  $\omega^{\beta_n} + 1 \subseteq V_n$  such that  $\omega^\alpha = \sum_{n \in \omega} \omega^{\beta_n}$ . The sum of these copies plus point  $g$  gives a subspace homeomorphic to  $\omega^\alpha + 1$ .  $\square$

## 5. MORE ON LOCAL EMBEDDABLE PROPERTIES

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the poset consisting of dimensional types of countable metric spaces  $X$  with  $1 < N(X) \in \omega$ . Many properties of  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q}) / \equiv_E, \leq_d)$  can be reduced to  $\mathcal{A}$ , as it is observed in [5, p. 69 - 81]. Let us discuss another local embeddable invariants, which are not mentioned in the paper [5]. Assume that  $X$  is a metric scattered space such that  $X^{(m)} = \{g\}$ , where  $0 < m \in \omega$ . We say that  $X$  has  $(m, 1)$ -stable dimensional type if no  $Y \subseteq X$  has smaller dimensional type than  $X$ ,

whenever  $X \setminus Y$  is a closed-open set and  $g \in Y$ . There exist exactly two  $(1, 1)$ -stable dimensional types, i.e. the dimensional type of the convergent sequence  $G = \omega + 1$  or the dimensional type of the subspace  $I = \omega^2 + 1 \setminus \{\omega, \omega \cdot 2, \omega \cdot 3, \dots\}$ . So,  $I$  is a space with the single cluster point which has a base of open neighborhoods  $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$  such that each difference  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  is infinite and discrete.

We leave the readers check that there exist exactly five  $(2, 1)$ -stable dimensional types. These are dimension types of following spaces:

$\omega^2 + 1$ ;  
 $\omega^3 + 1 \setminus \{\omega^2, \omega^2 \cdot 2, \omega^2 \cdot 3, \dots\}$ ;  
 $\sum_{\omega} I + 1 \subset \omega^3 + 1$ , where the subspace is established as a sequence of  $I$  followed by a copy of  $I$  (infinitely many times) and with 1 at the end;  
 $\sum_{\omega} I \oplus \sum_{\omega} I \oplus \sum_{\omega} I \oplus \dots + 1 \subset \omega^4 + 1$ , where the subspace is established as a sequence of  $\sum_{\omega} I$  followed by a copy of  $\sum_{\omega} I$  (infinitely many times) with 1 at the end and with the ordinals  $\omega^3, \omega^3 \cdot 2, \omega^3 \cdot 3, \dots$  thrown out;  
 $\sum_{\omega}(\omega^2 \oplus I) + 1 \subset \omega^3 + 1$ , where operation  $\sum_{\omega}(\dots) + 1$  is used as above and  $\omega^2 \oplus I \subset \omega^2 \cdot 2 + 1$  is the subspace of established as a copy of  $\omega^2$  followed by a copy of  $I$  with  $\omega^2$  thrown out.

If  $0 < n \in \omega$  and  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ , then we can prove the following.

**Theorem 11.** *There exist finitely many  $(n, 1)$ -stable dimensional types. Each  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  is a sum of closed-open subspaces with  $(k, 1)$ -stable dimensional types, where  $0 < k < N(X)$ .*

*Proof.* For  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  the theses are fulfilled. Let  $S_{n-1}$  be the family of all  $(k, 1)$ -stable dimensional types, where  $k < n$ . For inductive proof, assume that  $S_{n-1}$  is finite and each space  $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ , such that  $N(Y) \leq n$ , is a sum of closed-open subspaces with  $(k, 1)$ -stable dimensional types. Consider a space  $X$  with the  $(n, 1)$ -stable dimensional type such that  $X^{(n)} = \{g\}$ . By Theorem 3, the subspace  $X \setminus \{g\}$  can be divided into pairwise closed-open sets with Cantor-Bendixon rank equal to  $n$ . Therefore and by the induction assumptions, the subspace  $X \setminus \{g\}$  can be divided into finitely many closed-open sets, each of which consists of pairwise disjoint closed-open sets with the same  $(k, 1)$ -stable dimensional type, belonging to  $S_{n-1}$ . Denote  $\mathcal{V}$  the family of all relevant dimensional types for  $X \setminus \{g\}$ . Fix a decreasing

base  $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$  of open neighborhoods of the point  $g$  such that each  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  contains a single closed-open set which dimensional type is from  $\mathcal{V}$  or infinitely many such sets. Since  $X$  has the  $(n, 1)$ -stable dimensional type, therefore the dimensional type of  $X$  depends only on whether any dimensional type of  $\mathcal{V}$  occurs in  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  at most once or at least infinitely many times. Such opportunities are finitely many.  $\square$

We do not know whether the cardinality of families  $S_n$  may well be bounded by a polynomial in  $n$ . However, the concept of  $(k, 1)$ -stable dimensional types makes it easier to understand the results on poset  $(\mathcal{A}, <_E)$  and simplifies some of the reasoning from the paper [5]. In our opinion, combinatorial properties of families  $S_n$  require further examination, but that is a topic for future research.

## 6. DIMENSIONAL TYPES OF UNCOUNTABLE SUBSPACES OF $\omega_1$

Let  $\mathbb{Y}$  be the sum of all countable ordinals. Thus,  $\omega_1$  contains a homeomorphic copy of  $\mathbb{Y}$ . Hence,  $\mathbb{Y}$  is a metric space which has a smaller dimensional type than the not metric space  $\omega_1$ . The space  $\mathbb{Y}$  is special among the uncountable subspaces of  $\omega_1$ . Namely, if  $X \subset \omega_1$  is a metric subspace, then  $X <_E \mathbb{Y}$ . Indeed, take a open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$ , which consists of countable sets. Then, use any disjoint open refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$  to construct a required embedding.

**Proposition 12.** *If a subspace  $X \subseteq \omega_1$  contains a homeomorphic copy of any countable ordinal, then  $\mathbb{Y} <_E X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{I}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$  be a family of closed and pairwise disjoint intervals of  $\omega_1$  such that each intersection  $X \cap \mathcal{I}_\alpha$  contains a homeomorphic copy of  $\omega^\alpha + 1$ . Then  $X \cap \bigcup \mathbb{F}$  contains a copy of  $\mathbb{Y}$ .  $\square$

Recall that a set  $S \subseteq \omega_1$  is *stationary*, if  $S$  intersects any closed and unbounded subset of  $\omega_1$ , compare [10, p. 78]. Well-known Solovay's result says that each stationary set can be divided into uncountably many stationary sets, compare [7]. Note that, if  $X \subseteq \omega_1$  is not stationary, then  $X$  is a metric  $\sigma$ -discrete space. Indeed, any complement of a closed unbounded set is an union of pairwise disjoint open intervals of ordinals. Each such interval has to be countable. Therefore  $X$

is contained in a sum of metric spaces. By Theorem 2, it has to be  $\sigma$ -discrete.

**Proposition 13.** *If  $X \subset \omega_1$  is a discrete subspace, then  $X$  is not stationary.*

*Proof.* If  $X$  is bounded by an ordinal  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , then  $X$  is disjoint to the closed and unbounded interval  $(\alpha, \omega_1)$ , so we can assume that  $X$  is unbounded in  $\omega_1$ . Let  $\{(a_\alpha, b_\alpha) : \alpha \in X\}$  be an uncountable family of pairwise disjoint intervals such that  $X \cap (a_\alpha, b_\alpha) = \{\alpha\}$ , for each  $\alpha \in X$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\alpha < \beta$  implies  $a_\alpha < b_\alpha \leq a_\beta < b_\beta$ . We get that the complement of an open set

$$\bigcup \{(a_\alpha, b_\alpha) : \alpha \in X\} \supset X$$

is unbounded, because it contains  $\{b_\alpha : \alpha \in X\}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 14.** *If  $X$  is a stationary set and  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , then  $X^{(\alpha)} \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $X^{(\alpha)} = \emptyset$ , where  $\alpha < \omega_1$ . Then

$$X = \bigcup \{X^{(\beta)} \setminus X^{(\beta+1)} : \beta < \alpha\}$$

is an union of countably many subspaces with discrete subspace topologies. Since Proposition 13 and [10, p. 78], the set  $X$  can not be stationary.  $\square$

Following M. Ismail and A. Szymański [6], the *discrete metrizable number* of a space  $X$ , denoted  $dm(X)$ , is the smallest cardinal number  $\kappa$  such that  $X$  can be represented as a union of  $\kappa$  many discrete subspaces. But the *metrizable number*  $m(X)$ , is the smallest cardinal number  $\kappa$  such that  $X$  can be represented as a union of  $\kappa$  many metric subspaces. We have the following.

**Corollary 15.** *If  $X \subseteq \omega_1$  is a stationary set, then  $dm(X) = \omega_1 = m(X)$ .*

*Proof.* A stationary set can not be a union of countably many not stationary subsets. Hence, we get  $dm(X) = \omega_1 = m(X)$ , using Theorem 2 and Proposition 13.  $\square$

**Lemma 16.** *If  $X \subseteq \omega_1$  and  $f : X \rightarrow \omega_1$  is an embedding, then there exists a closed unbounded set  $C$  such that*

$$f[X] \cap C = X \cap C$$

*Proof.* For countable  $X$ , the set  $\{\alpha : \sup\{X \cup f[X]\} < \alpha\}$  is what we need. Suppose  $X$  is uncountable. Successively by induction choose strictly greater ordinals  $x_{n,\alpha} \in X$  and  $y_{n,\alpha} \in f[X]$  such that

$$x_{\beta,k} < x_{\alpha,n} < y_{\alpha,n} < x_{\alpha,n+1},$$

where  $k, n \in \omega$  and  $\beta < \alpha < \omega_1$ . These ordinals constitute an increasing sequence lexicographical ordered with respect to indices. Cluster points of the set of these ordinals, give the required closed unbounded set.  $\square$

Obviously, the above lemma follows that disjoint stationary sets have not comparable dimensional types.

**Theorem 17.** *If  $X$  is a stationary set, then the poset  $(\mathcal{P}(X)/\equiv_E, \leq_d)$  contains uncountable anti-chains and uncountable strictly descending chains.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{S_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subseteq X$  be a family of pairwise disjoint stationary set, a such family exists since the mentioned above result of R. Solovay. Since Lemma 16, elements of this family have not comparable dimensional types. Also for the same reasons, sets  $X_\beta = \bigcup\{S_\alpha : \beta < \alpha\}$  constitute an uncountable strictly descending chains, with respect to the order  $<_E$ .  $\square$

## 7. GENERALIZED KNASTER-URBANIK THEOREM

Generalizing the above proof of Knaster-Urbaniak Theorem, and using Theorem 3, we get a proof of the following result by R. Telgársky [18], compare [1].

**Corollary.** *Any metric scattered space is homeomorphic to a subset of an ordinal number.*

*Proof.* If  $X$  is a discrete space, then  $X$  can be embedded into a set of non-limit ordinals, which has to be a subset of some ordinal. Suppose  $X$  is a metric space such that  $X^{(\alpha)} = \{g\}$ , where  $\alpha > 0$ . Assume that any subspace  $Y \subseteq X$  can be embedded into the ordinal  $E(Y)$ , as long as  $Y^{(\beta)}$  has exactly one point and  $\beta < \alpha$ . Without loss of generality,



we can assume that  $f_Y : Y \rightarrow E(Y)$  is an embedding such that

$$f_Y[Y^{(\beta)}] = \{\sup E(Y)\}, \text{ where } |Y^{(\beta)}| = 1.$$

Let  $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$  be a decreasing base of neighborhoods of  $g$  consisting of closed-open sets. By Theorem 3, there exist pairwise disjoint closed-open sets  $Y_{\xi,n} \subseteq U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  such that for each  $Y_{\xi,n}$  has exactly one point derivative  $Y_{\xi,n}^{(\beta)}$ , where  $\beta < \alpha$ . We order ordinals  $E(Y_{\xi,n})$  as follows:  $E(Y_{\xi,n})$  followed by  $E(Y_{\nu,n})$ , with respect to the order of first indexes, and with 1 at the end. In the next step, we order similarly ordinals  $E(Y_{\xi,n+1})$  and place them, keeping their order, after 1 located at the end of an ordered collection in the previous step. Finally we put the point  $g$ . The union of all  $f_{Y_{\xi,n}}$  contained in the corresponding  $E(Y_{\xi,n})$ , which are ordered as above, gives the required embedding.  $\square$

If  $\mathfrak{m}$  is an infinite cardinal number, then  $\mathfrak{m}^+$  denotes the least cardinal number greater than  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Thus, the above corollary can be formulated more precisely.

**Proposition 18.** *Any metric scattered space of the cardinality  $\mathfrak{m}$  is homeomorphic to a subset of an ordinal  $\alpha < \mathfrak{m}^+$ .*

*Proof.* If a metric scattered space  $X$  has the cardinality  $\mathfrak{m}$  and  $X^{(\alpha)}$  is the last non-empty derivative, then  $\alpha < \mathfrak{m}^+$ . It is enough to see that with the same proof as for the above corollary, the space  $X$  is embeddable in  $\mathfrak{m}^+$ .  $\square$

## 8. NON-HOMEOMORPHIC METRIC SCATTERED SPACES

Let us start with an improvement of Mazurkiewicz-Sierpiński Theorem [13, Théorème 3], which says that there is continuum many non-homeomorphic countable metric scattered spaces.

**Proposition 19.** *The ordinal  $\omega^\omega$  contains continuum many non-homeomorphic subspaces.*

*Proof.* For a binary sequence  $(f_1, f_2, \dots)$  define inductively scattered spaces  $X(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m)$ , with the one-point  $m$ -derivative  $\{h_m\}$ . Put  $X(0) = G$  and  $X(1) = I$ , where spaces  $G$  and  $I$  are the same as it is defined in Section 5. The cluster points of  $G$  and  $I$  can be denoted

$g_G$  and  $g_I$ , respectively. If a space  $X(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n)$  is already defined, then let

$$X(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n, 0) = X(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n) \times (G \setminus \{g_G\}) \cup \{(h_n, g_G)\}$$

be a subspace of the product space  $X(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n) \times G$ . And let

$$X(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n, 1) = X(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n) \times (I \setminus \{g_I\}) \cup \{(h_n, g_I)\}$$

be the subspace of the product space  $X(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n) \times I$ .

If  $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots)$  is an infinite binary sequence, then let  $X_f$  be the sum of spaces  $\{X(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n) : 0 < n \in \omega\}$ . So, we have  $X_f^{(\omega)} = \emptyset$ . Also, if  $0 < n$  and  $f_n = 0$ , then the difference  $X_f^{(n-1)} \setminus X_f^{(n+1)}$  is a subspace which consists of pairwise disjoint closed-open (with respect to the inherited topology) sets homeomorphic to a convergent sequence. But if  $f_n = 1$ , then the difference  $X_f^{(n-1)} \setminus X_f^{(n+1)}$  has no closed-open subset which is homeomorphic to a convergent sequence. Therefore  $\{X_f : f \in 2^\omega\}$  is a family of non-homeomorphic subspaces of the ordinal  $\omega^\omega$ , what we need.  $\square$

Consider the sum of  $\omega$  many copies of a space  $X$ . We defined the spaces  $G(X)$  and  $I(X)$  by adding a new point  $g$ , with a countable base of neighborhoods, to this sum. Points belonging to the sum have unchanged bases of neighborhoods. The point  $g$  has a decreasing base  $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$  such that  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  consists of copies of  $X$  as closed-open subsets. So, in  $G(X)$  each  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  consists of a single copy of  $X$ . However, each  $U_n \setminus U_{n+1}$  consists of infinitely many copies of  $X$  in  $I(X)$ . In particular,  $G = G(1)$  and  $I = I(1)$ .

**Theorem 20.** *For each infinite cardinal number  $\mathfrak{m}$ , there exist  $2^{\mathfrak{m}}$  many non-homeomorphic metric spaces of the cardinality  $\mathfrak{m}$ , each one with empty  $\mathfrak{m}$ -derivative.*

*Proof.* Since Proposition 19, we can assume that  $\mathfrak{m}$  is an uncountable cardinal. For every binary sequence  $f = \{f_\beta : 0 < \beta < \mathfrak{m}\}$  define inductively a scattered space  $Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\beta)$  as follows. Put  $Y(0) = G$  and  $Y(1) = I$ . Suppose that metric scattered spaces  $Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\delta)$  are already defined, for  $\delta < \beta$ . If  $\beta$  is a limit ordinal, then put

$$Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\beta) = J(\{Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\delta) : \delta < \beta\}).$$

If  $\beta$  is a non-limit ordinal, then put

$$Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{\beta-1}, 0) = G(Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{\beta-1}))$$

and

$$Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{\beta-1}, 1) = I(Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{\beta-1})).$$

Finally, let  $Y(f)$  be the sum of spaces  $Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\beta)$ , where  $\beta < \mathfrak{m}$ .

By the definition, if  $\beta < \mathfrak{m}$ , then each space  $Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\beta)$  has the cardinality less than  $\mathfrak{m}$ . We also have  $Y(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\beta)^{(\mathfrak{m})} = \emptyset$ , hence  $Y(f)^{(\mathfrak{m})} = \emptyset$ . Bearing above in mind and using Proposition 18, one can check that each  $Y(f)$  embeds into  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Since each  $Y(f)$  has the cardinality  $\mathfrak{m}$ , it remains to show that the family  $\{Y(f) : f \in 2^{\mathfrak{m}}\}$  contains a subfamily of cardinality  $2^{\mathfrak{m}}$  consisting of non-homeomorphic metric scattered space. Indeed, if  $\gamma < \mathfrak{m}$  is a non-limit ordinal and  $f(\gamma) \neq g(\gamma)$ , where  $f, g \in 2^{\mathfrak{m}}$ , then the subspaces  $Y(f)^{(\gamma)} \setminus Y(f)^{(\gamma+2)}$  and  $Y(g)^{(\gamma)} \setminus Y(g)^{(\gamma+2)}$  are not homeomorphic, since one of them consists of closed-open subsets homeomorphic to  $I$ , but the second contains no homeomorphic copy of  $I$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Arosio, A. V. Ferreira, *On nonseparable 0-dimensional metric spaces*. Portugal. Math. 37 (1978), no. 3-4, 273 - 297 (1981).
- [2] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, (1977).
- [3] R. Engelking, *Teoria wymiaru*. (Pastwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warsaw, (1977).
- [4] M. Fréchet, *Les dimensions d'un ensemble abstrait*, Math. Ann., 68 (1910), 145 - 168.
- [5] W. D. Gillam, *Embeddable properties of countable metric spaces*. Topology Appl. 148 (2005), no. 1-3, 63 - 82.
- [6] M. Ismail, A. Szymański, *On the metrizable number and related invariants of spaces*. Topology Appl. 63 (1995), no. 1, 69 - 77.
- [7] T. Jech, *Set theory*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1997).
- [8] V. Kannan, M. Rajagopalan, *On scattered spaces*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 43 (1974), 402 - 408.
- [9] B. Knaster, K. Urbanik, *Sur les espaces complets sparables de dimension 0*. Fund. Math. 40, (1953). 194 - 202.
- [10] K. Kunen, *Set theory. An introduction to independence proofs*. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, 102. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, (1980).
- [11] K. Kuratowski, *Topology-Volume I*. Transl. by J. Jaworowski, Academic Press, New York-London; Pastwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw (1966).
- [12] K. Kuratowski, *Topology-Volume II*. Transl. by A. Kirkor Academic Press, New York-London; Pastwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw (1968).

- [13] S. Mazurkiewicz, W. Sierpiński, *Contribution à la topologie des ensembles dénombrables*. Fund. Math. I (1920), 17 - 27.
- [14] Sz. Plewik, *On subspaces of the Pixley-Roy example*. Colloq. Math. 44 (1981), no. 1, 41 - 46.
- [15] T. C. Przymusiński, *Normality and paracompactness of Pixley-Roy hyperspaces*. Fund. Math. 113 (1981), no. 3, 201 - 219.
- [16] W. Sierpiński, *Introduction to General Topology*. Lecturer in Mathematics at the University of Toronto. The University of Toronto Press (1934).
- [17] W. Sierpiński, *General topology*. Mathematical Expositions, No. 7, University of Toronto Press, Toronto (1952).
- [18] R. Telgársky, *Total paracompactness and paracompact dispersed spaces*. Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys. 16 (1968), 567 - 572.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA, UL. BANKOWA 14,  
40-007 KATOWICE

*E-mail address:* `plewik@math.us.edu.pl`

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA, UL. BANKOWA 14,  
40-007 KATOWICE

*E-mail address:* `mwalczyńska@us.edu.pl`